UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/532,326	05/16/2006	Karl-Heinz Daum	4791-4000	1670
7278 DARBY & DA	7590 09/11/200 RBY P.C.	EXAMINER		
P.O. BOX 770 Church Street S	tation	LEE, REBECCA Y		
New York, NY		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1793	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			09/11/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/532,326	DAUM ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
REBECCA LEE	1793	

		NEBEOON EEE	1738
	The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address
THE REPLY	FILED <u>08 September 2009</u> FAILS TO PLACE THI	S APPLICATION IN CONDITION I	FOR ALLOWANCE.
applica applica	ply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on ation, applicant must timely file one of the following ation in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appentinued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 Cos:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	it, or other evidence, which places the with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request
a) 🔲 Th	e period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing	g date of the final rejection.	
no no	e period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la aminer Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailin	g date of the final rejection.
	ONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(
have been file under 37 CFR set forth in (b)	time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date id is the date for purposes of determining the period of exit 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the stabove, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later my earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). APPEAL	tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply origi than three months after the mailing da	of the fee. The appropriate extension fee inally set in the final Office action; or (2) as
	otice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp	liance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be	filed within two months of the date of
filing th	ne Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed w	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a
3. 🛛 The p	roposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, I	but prior to the date of filing a brief,	will <u>not</u> be entered because
	They raise new issues that would require further co		TE below);
	They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo	•	
—	They are not deemed to place the application in bet	ter form for appeal by materially re	ducing or simplifying the issues for
	appeal; and/or They present additional claims without canceling a o	corresponding number of finally reig	acted claims
(u)	NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.1		soled diamins.
4.	mendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	,	mpliant Amendment (PTOL-324)
	cant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):		
	proposed or amended claim(s) would be all		timely filed amendment canceling the
non-al	lowable claim(s).		
how th	rposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) le new or amended claims would be rejected is provatus of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		ll be entered and an explanation of
	s) allowed:		
Claim(s) objected to:		
	s) rejected: <u>1-13 and 22-25</u> .		
	s) withdrawn from consideration: <u>14-21</u> . OR OTHER EVIDENCE		
8. The af	fidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu se applicant failed to provide a showing of good and ot earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).		
entere	fidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing d because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o ng a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fails to provide a
	affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation	n of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attached.
	FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER		
See (equest for reconsideration has been considered bu Continuation Sheet.	, , , , , ,	n condition for allowance because:
12.	the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (r:	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)	
/Roy King	7/		
	ry Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1793		

Continuation of 3. NOTE: The amended feature in claim 1 changes the scope of the finally rejected claim 1, and requires further search and consideration.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant traverses the rejections on the ground that the references do not teach returning the SO2 containing gas to the first contact stage. Applicant argues Kerner et al. merely teach the SO2 containing gas (which contains SO3 as well due to incomplete conversion of SO3 to sulfuric acid) is recycles back to the combustion furnace (Column 4, lines 29-32). However, after the SO2 containing gas passes through the combustion furnace, it will flow into the contact apparatus (first contact stage) (Column 4, lines 16-50 and Fig 1); thus, reads on the claim limitation. Furthermore, Masseling is incorporated into the process of Kerner and teaches the recirculation of sulfur oxides.

Applicant then argues Masseling and Kerner are not combinable. However, examiner only relies on Masseling's teaching of recycling the sulfur oxide. One of ordinary skill in the art would have found it obvious to incorporate the teaching of recycling sulfur oxides of Masseling into the process of Kerner in order to increase the yield of the product.

Applicant further argues none of the references address the catalyst overheating problem. However, this feature is not recited in the claims. In addition, since the process is obvious over the combined references, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to expect the same issue, catalyst overheating problem, would have been taken care of.

Applicant's remaining arguments regarding the amended feature of claim 1 change the scope of the finally rejected claims which require further search and consideration.